

1 JS-6
2
3
4
5
6
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 TONY BOBULINSKI, } Case No. 2:25-cv-02713 CV (AJRx)
11 }
12 Plaintiff, } **ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF**
13 } **TONY BOBULINSKI'S UNOPPOSED**
14 v. } **MOTION FOR REMAND [DOC. # 21]**
15 HUGH DICKSON, *et al.*, }
16 Defendants. }

17
18 On May 8 2025, Plaintiff Tony Bobulinski (“Plaintiff”) filed an Unopposed
19 Motion for Remand, Doc. # 21 (“Motion”). The Motion designated May 23, 2025, for a
20 hearing of the Motion. *See Id.* On May 8, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Reply in support of the
21 Motion. Doc. # 22. Plaintiff sought remand of this case based on evidence that at least
22 one partner of Defendant Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP (“Sheppard
23 Mulllin”) was an American citizen domiciled abroad, which has the effect of destroying
24 diversity for the purposes of federal subject matter jurisdiction. *See* Doc. # 21-1
25 [Declaration of Sam S. Meehan] ¶¶ 2–3; *Lincoln Prop. Co. v. Roche*, 546 U.S. 81, 84
26 (2005) (“[T]o meet the complete diversity requirement [for subject-matter jurisdiction],
27 all partners, limited as well as general, must be diverse from all parties on the opposing
28 side.”) (citing *Carden v. Arkoma Assocs.*, 494 U.S. 185, 192–97 (1990)); *Swiger v.*

1 *Allegheny Energy, Inc.*, 540 F.3d 179, 185 (3d Cir. 2008) (“Because Morgan Lewis has a
2 stateless partner, and thus, all partners of Morgan Lewis are not diverse from all parties
3 on the opposing side, the district court correctly held that it lacked diversity jurisdiction
4 over this action.”); *Int'l Venture Assocs. v. Hawayek*, No. C 13-01254 RS, 2013 WL
5 2646188, at *3 (N.D. Cal. June 12, 2013) (holding that since a U.S. citizen domiciled
6 abroad was a partner of the plaintiff partnership, the partnership was considered
7 “stateless” and there was no diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1)).

8 The May 23, 2025, hearing date required Defendants to file an opposition to the
9 Motion no later than May 2, 2025. *See* Local Rule 7-9. Defendants did not file any
10 opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion. Accordingly, the Court will VACATE the hearing date
11 and GRANT Plaintiff’s Motion. *See* Local Rule 7-12. It is HEREBY ORDERED that this
12 matter be remanded back to the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Los
13 Angeles, for further proceedings.

14
15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16
17 DATED: 5/13/25

18
19 
HON. CYNTHIA VALENZUELA
S

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28